

GAHC010248462025



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/588/2025

MD ANOWARUL ISLAM AND 11 ORS.
S/O- BOKTAR ALI AKOND, R/O- VILL- TELIPARA, P.O- MANKACHAR, DIST-
SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR, ASSAM

2: ROBIOL HOQUE
S/O LT. ABDUL HAMID MIAH
R/O VILL- DAKERGAON
P.O.- MANKACHAR
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

3: MERINA BEGUM
D/O MAMINUL HOQUE
R/O COLLEGE NAGAR
P.O.- MANKACHAR
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

4: JAHANGIR HUSSAIN
S/O SHAH ALOM ALI SK
R/O VILL- CHARKHOLISHA MARI
P.O.- HAZARIHAT
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

5: SOHID ALOM
S/ OMD. ALIM UDDIN
R/O VILL- CHIRA KHOWA KUTIRGHAT
P.O.- KALAPANI
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

6: HOBIBOR RAHMAN MOLLAH
S/O MD. ABDUL KUDDUS MOLLAH

VILL- CHIRA KHOWA KUTIRGHAT
P.O.- KALAPANI
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

7: MEHER ALI SHEIKH
S/O SHAHA ZAMAL SK.
R/O VILL- BORO BAGHAJHAPA
P.O.- HAZIRHAT
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

8: NAZIMA SULTANA CHOUDHURY
W/O LT. CHAND MIAH
R/O VILL- BEPARI PARA MANKACHAR
P.O.- MANKACHAR
DIST-SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

9: ATOWAR RAHMAN
S/O AKBAR ALI
R/O VILL- BORO BALUBAGHMARA
P.O.- SUKCHAR
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

10: MD. SAIFUL ISLAM
S/O KHATAM ALI
R/O VILL- KESHERVITA
P.O.- JHAWDANGA DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

11: NURUDDIN AHMED
S/O ABDUL GOFUR AHMED
R/O VILL- BAMUNPARA
P.O.- MANULLAPAR
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSAM

12: FULBOR HUSSAIN
S/O ABDUS SOBUR
R/O VILL- BAMUNPARA
P.O.- MANULLAPAR
DIST- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR
ASSA

VERSUS

NARAYAN KONWAR, IAS AND ANR
THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM,
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, ASSAM, DISPUR, GUWAHATI-06

2:SURANJANA SENAPATI
ACS
THE DIRECTOR OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
ASSAM
KAHILIPARA
GUWAHATI-1

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. T SK, MR. RASHIDUL ISLAM

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE SHAMIMA JAHAN

ORDER

Date : 18.03.2026

Heard Mr. T SK, learned Counsel for the petitioner.

The office note reflects that the service of notice upon respondent no.1 and 2 is not complete properly although the reports says that notice has been received by the office staff of the respondents.

In view of the same, the learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be allowed to take fresh steps upon respondent no.1 and 2.

Prayer is allowed.

The petitioner is allowed to take fresh steps for service of notice upon respondent no.1 and 2 by speed post with AD or by usual process and returnable in two weeks.

List this after two weeks on a date to be fixed by the Registry.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant